UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/606,811	06/28/2000	Jian Wang	MS1-452US	6463

22801 7590 06/03/2005		EXAMINER
LEE & HAYES PLLC		OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2655	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/606,811	WANG ET AL.
		Examiner	**Art Unit**
		Michael N. Opsasnick	2655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/21/04, 1/3/05, and 1/31/05.*

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *53-85, 87 and 88* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *53-85, 87 and 88* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *6/28/2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/3/05; 1/31/05.*

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 53-63,65-70,72-80,82-85,87,88 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

unpatentable over Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura (5987403).

As per claims 53,74,87,88, Miike et al (5214583) teaches a language input user

interface (as language translator –col. 2 lines 37-47) comprising:

"a line based entry area; an input text displayed with the line based entry area; and

an output text.....area" as character key input, edit region, and translated region (Figs.

2+3).

Miike et al (5214583) teaches the display to contain the original text and the

translated text, but is not explicitly clear as to the proximity of the two texts, however,

Sugimura (5987403) teaches displaying the target and source data together (fig. 13,

subblock S53; figs. 7 and figs. 17 offering different display patterns, with one type shown

in figure 6.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of

language translation interfaces to modify the teaching of Miike et al (5214583) with

displaying the text result in the same area as the input because it would advantageously

show the display properties of the original text with the translated text (Sugimura

(5987403), col. 1 lines 8-15).

As per claims 54,75, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of

Sugimura (5987403) teaches the input text comprises phonetic text and the output text is

character based (Miike et al (5214583),as morpheme and grammar translation (Fig. 5,

and character output – fig. 7).

As per claims 56,77, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of

Sugimura (5987403) teaches a horizontal interface (Miike et al (5214583),Fig. 2)

As per claims 57,78, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of

Sugimura (5987403) teaches replacing the original word with the translated word as the

output text –>(Miike et al (5214583), Fig. 6b, T9)

As per claim 58, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura

(5987403) teaches the user editing the input, to change the output, based on the original

output (Miike et al (5214583), col. 5 lines 51-54)

As per claim 59, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura

(5987403) teaches a conversion process that ignore no-word characters, such as a "/",

which can be construed as punctuations (Miike et al (5214583), col. 5 line 62 – col. 6 line

29)

As per claim 60, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura

(5987403) teaches a no editing mode, which results in the output text is fixed (Miike et al

(5214583), abstract)

As per claims 61,79, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of

Sugimura (5987403) teaches selecting the edit areas for translation (Miike et al

(5214583), fig. 4, subblock S4-S10 → wherein the edit area is selected, not the mode)

As per claim 62, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura

(5987403) teaches edit window adjacent to output text (Miike et al (5214583), Fig. 3)

As per claims 63,80, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of

Sugimura (5987403) teaches line based entry orthogonal to the edit window (Miike et al

(5214583), fig. 3)

As per claims 65,82, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of

Sugimura (5987403) teaches listing a plurality of candidates (Miike et al (5214583), Fig.

3), indicating a layout to show more than one possibility (Miike et al (5214583), Figs. 9 and 10)

As per claim 66, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura (5987403) teaches listing the candidates according to alphabetical ranking (Miike et al (5214583), for e.g., fig. 16, "computer" generates a list of 302,305, and 341, as shown in Fig. 15)

As per claim 67, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura (5987403) teaches listing the candidates in a display; Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and notoriously well known in the art of displays to have a scrollable list of items, so that when the list if bigger than the screen itself, the user can access the rest of the list by scrolling.

As per claims 68,83, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura (5987403) teaches a first candidate list of possibilities with a second candidate list containing the whole set (Miike et al (5214583), for e.g., fig. 16, "computer" generates a list of 302,305, and 341, as shown in Fig. 15).

As per claim 69, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura (5987403) teaches listing the items from being more complex to less complex (Miike et al (5214583), Fig. 14)

As per claim 70, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura (5987403) teaches arranging a first candidate list according to decrease complexity (fig. 14) and a second list that is different (Miike et al (5214583), in this instance, not complexity, but alphabetically—Fig. 15)

As per claims 72,84,87,88, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura (5987403) teaches the input phonetic and non-phonetic text to be displayed with the output text (as morphological analysis of the input, which is not limited to characters only (Miike et al (5214583), Fig. 9, col. 6 lines 5-15 -- kanja and katakana))

As per claims 73,85, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura (5987403) teaches machine translator (Miike et al (5214583), col. 3 lines 33-43).

As per claims 55 and 76, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura (5987403) does not explicitly teach Chinese Pinyin and Chinese Hanzi as the input/output languages, respectively. However, Miike et al (5214583) teaches any language pair (col. 7 lines 60-85). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of language translation to modify the teachings of Miike et al (5214583) to use Chinese Pinyin and Chinese Hanzi as input/output because it is a design choice as suggested by Miike et al (col. 7 lines 60-65).

3.   Claims 64,71,81 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the

combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura (5987403) in further view of

Beauregard et al (5974413).

As per claims 64,71, and 81, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of

Sugimura (5987403) does not explicitly teach using an input text hint, however,

Beauregard et al (5974413) teaches a feedback of a corrected version of already inputted

text (Fig. 14; col. 29 lines 25-45)). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art of language interfaces to modify the teachings of the combination

of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura (5987403) with a corrected (hinted) version

because it would offer the user a quicker alternative to find the match (Beauregard et al

(5974413), col. 29, lines 40-42).

As per claim 71, the combination of Miike et al (5214583) in view of Sugimura

(5987403) in further view of Beauregard et al (5974413) further teaches listing a plurality

of candidates (Miike et al (5214583),Fig. 3), indicating a layout to show more than one

possibility (Miike et al (5214583) Figs. 9 and 10).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5.   **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

> Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
> Washington, D.C. 20231
> **or faxed to:**
> (703) 872 9314,
> (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")
> Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121
> Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (571)272-7623, who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, Mr. David Ometz, can be reached at (571)272-7593. The facsimile phone number for this group is (571)272-7629.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2600 receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600, the 2600 Customer Service telephone number is (571)272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mno
5/21/05

Michael N. Opsasnick
Examiner
Art Unit 2655